



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Council of Constance. The demand for John's resignation, which had been at first a low and timid murmur, soon became the general clamour. The charges formerly made against the abominable life of the Pope were revived in their unmitigated blackness. Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, at the head of the English bishops, urged with much vigour the necessity of a searching reformation of all orders in the Church. The honest islander broke out into righteous indignation, and declared that the Pope deserved to be burnt at the stake. After some delay, John gave a conditional promise of resignation, but it was notorious that he meditated escape from the city. The Cardinal St. Angelo, one of his adherents, attempted to pass the gates, but was arrested by the guard; and the Pope, thereupon, loudly complained of the violation of the imperial safe-conduct, which, in the case of John Huss, he himself had trampled under foot. At length the Pope succeeded in making his escape, but the Council, nothing daunted, determined to proceed to extremities. They fixed on the gates of the city, and on the doors of all the churches, a formal citation, to Pope John XXIII. to answer for the maintenance of the schism; for heresy, simony, and dilapidation of the estates of the Papacy; for the scandals and notorious criminalities of his life and conversation.

The time assigned for the Pope's appearance having expired, the Council proceeded in its course. Seventy charges were exhibited; and never, probably, were seventy more awful accusations brought against man than against the so-called vicar of Christ. The Cardinal St. Mark made a feeble attempt to repel the charge of heresy; against the darker charges no one spoke a word. Before the final decree, sixteen of those of the most indescribable depravity were dropped, out of respect not to the Pope, but to public decency and the dignity of the office. On the remaining undefended fifty-four charges, the Council deliberately pronounced the sentence of deposition. A body of three hundred armed men went to seize the fugitive. He was first brought to the castle of Rodolfzell, when his sentence was read to him by two cardinals, the justice of which he fully acknowledged. He was then, by a strange coincidence, brought to the strong castle of Gotleben, where John Huss had been for some months pining in unmerited imprisonment.

The prosecution of Huss had been revived in the Council almost simultaneously with the deposition of Pope John. His enemies employed the utmost industry in collecting obnoxious passages from his writings, on which to frame articles of accusation against him. On the 5th of June he was brought in chains before the Council. His works were presented to him, and the articles of accusation were read. Huss calmly declared himself ready to maintain his opinions by Scripture and the Fathers, but an outburst of abuse and mockery compelled the Council to adjourn its proceedings.

Three times Huss was brought before the Council. Thirty-nine articles were exhibited against him, and the Council sat annoyed and embarrassed, while Huss appealed triumphantly to St. Augustine and St. Bernard in proof of his assertion, that "the pontiff who lives not the life of Peter is no vicar of Christ, but the forerunner of anti-christ," and that "the slave of avarice was the successor, not of Peter, but of Judas Iscariot." Huss was guilty of the unpardonable rashness of discomfiting and perplexing his adversaries. The Emperor urged him to make unqualified submission to the Council, and to abjure all his errors. Huss replied, with firm humility, that he could not abjure errors of which he was not convinced. Many things charged against him, he said, were forged, many perverted from their true meaning, and he could not retract without perjury to his own conscience. "It is better for me," he concluded, "to die, than, by avoiding momentary punishment, to fall into the hands of God, and perhaps into everlasting fire. I have appealed to Jesus Christ, the one all-powerful and all-just Judge; to Him I commit my cause, who will judge every man, not according to false witnesses and erring councils, but according to truth and men's desert."

The Council at last met in the cathedral, and the Bishop of Lodi preached from the text, "That the body of sin might be destroyed" (Rom. vi. 6). He placed Huss in the same rank with Arius and Sabellius, and closed his sermon with extravagant praises of the Emperor. "It is thy glorious office," he exclaimed, "to destroy heresies and schism, especially this obstinate heretic." At these words he pointed to Huss, who was kneeling in an elevated place, and in fervent prayer.

The Bishop of Concordia rose to read the two sentences, one condemning the writings, the other the person of John Huss to the flames. Huss was commanded to kneel to hear his own sentence. It stated that the Council, having the fear of God before its eyes, declared Huss a real and manifest heresiarch, who had advanced doctrines offensive, rash, and seditious, had trampled under foot the power of the keys and the censures of the Church, and had scandalised all true Christians by his appeal to Jesus Christ. Huss broke in, "I have ever desired, and still desire, to be instructed out of the holy Scriptures." The bishop concluded with

condemning him to be degraded and despoiled of his orders. Huss rose from his knees and uttered a fervent prayer to God to pardon his enemies. Some of the older priests, even bishops, looked sternly at him, and laughed his prayers to scorn. He was stripped of his robes, the tonsure was effaced, a high paper crown, daubed over with devils, was set on his head, and the assembled bishops concluded with the words—"We devote thy soul to the devils in hell." So the Church made over the heresiarch to the secular arm. The Emperor delivered him to the imperial vicar, the vicar to the magistrates of Constance, the magistrates to the executioners.

The place of execution was a meadow without the walls. Huss knelt down and prayed aloud—"Lord Jesus, for Thy sake I endure with patience this cruel death. I beseech Thee to pardon mine enemies." He recited several Psalms with the perpetual burthen, "Lord Jesus, have mercy upon me. Into Thy hands I commend my spirit." The whole multitude from the city had assembled to witness the execution. "We know not," said the people, "what this man may have done; we only know that his prayers to God are excellent." He was tied fast by an old rusty chain to the stake, which was fixed on a platform. The fire blazed up; it is said that an old woman was busy in heaping up the wood. With the last feeble sounds of his voice he was heard to chaunt verses of the Psalms, and to pray to the Redeemer. All the remains of the body were torn to pieces, even his clothes were thrown into the fire, and the ashes were gathered and cast into the lake, lest his disciples should make reliques of them. But their faithful piety scraped together the earth around the pile, and carried it to Bohemia.

So perished John Huss as an obstinate, incorrigible heretic, but his heresy has never been clearly defined. It was not a denial of any of the great truths of Christianity, nor any of those peculiar Roman tenets of belief rejected afterwards by the German and English Reformers. On Transubstantiation, the Communion in one kind, the Worship of the Saints and the Virgin Mary, Huss was as orthodox, in the Romish sense, as any of his accusers. He was one of the first distinguished martyrs for Christian liberty, and freedom of opinion; he had raised his testimony against that supreme ecclesiastical dominion which so long ruled the mind of man; and he at length fell a victim to the power of the Roman hierarchy, whose authority he had successfully resisted.

We cannot conclude without inviting the attention of our readers to the remarkable contrast which is presented in the foregoing narrative. Two men, both bearing the name of John, were arraigned before the Council of Constance for different violations of the laws of God and man. Pope John XXIII. was accused of the very foulest crimes. According to the sentence of the Council, he had been guilty from his youth, and during his whole life, of licentiousness which passes belief, promiscuous concubinage, incest, the violation of nuns; of the most atrocious cruelties, murder, massacre, the most grinding tyranny, unglutted avarice, unblushing simony; inasmuch that (in the language of the Council) he was commonly known by the name of the *Devil Incarnate*. Yet, after his deposition from the popedom, he was raised again to the rank of a cardinal, and permitted to close his days in peace, and even in honour.

The second, John Huss, of life blameless to austerity, absolutely unimpeachable in his morals, was accused of having denounced the corruptions and vices of the clergy, and of erroneous belief in transubstantiation. The latter charge he distinctly denied, and repelled to the satisfaction of most present; and, although it is even now difficult to define or apprehend the precise delinquencies or errors of which he was arraigned and found guilty, yet, notwithstanding the protection of the imperial safe-conduct, he was seized, imprisoned, and burnt at the stake. The judicial murder of the Bohemian Reformer (for it deserves no milder name) will for ever remain an indelible blot on the boasted justice and impartiality of the Church of Rome.

#### EGO ABSOLVO TE—I ABSOLVE THEE.—No. I.

SOME of our readers who have taken an interest in our articles upon the ancient Liturgies have asked us to treat in the same way some of the other formularies of the Church, and to show what was practised in the first ages; and they especially ask us to do this with the form of absolution as practised in the Church of Rome. We gladly comply with their request, thinking this method peculiarly suited to the case of absolution.

The Church of Rome holds that penance is a sacrament of the Gospel, instituted by Christ Himself. The Council of Trent has expressly declared in what "the form" of this sacrament consists:—"The holy Synod also teaches that

\* Throughout the greater part of the above, we have nearly transcribed the graphic narrative of Milman, who observes, that the whole description of the last hours of Huss is from Reichenhal, and the two nameless biographers of Huss, who were all eye-witnesses.

\* Unus articulus qui fuit in ordine sextus plura vitia conclusit sub hac forma. Item quod dictus Johannes fuit et est pauperum oppressor; justitiae persecutor; iniquitatum columna; simoniacorum status; carnis cultor; vitiorum fex; a virtutibus peregrinus; infamie speculum; et omnium malitiarum profundus admonitor; adeo et in tantum scandalizans ecclesiam Christi, quod inter Christi fideles vitam et mores cognoscere vult garit dicitur Diabolus Incarnatus." It is thus that a Council speaks of a Pope!—Gobelinus, p. 311.

the form of the sacrament of penance, in which especially its force is situated, is placed in the words, 'I absolve thee.' (Sess. xiv., cap. 3).

The Catechism of the Council of Trent lays down that "Every sacrament consists of two things:—'matter,' which is called the element; and 'form,' which is commonly called 'the word.' This is the doctrine of the fathers of the Church, upon which the testimony of St. Augustine is familiar to all: 'The word,' says he, 'is joined to the element, and it becomes a sacrament.'"

If any person should pour water on another, that would not be the sacrament of baptism, unless the form of words appointed by Christ were said:—"I baptise thee, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Just so, there can be no sacrament of penance unless "the form" of words is used—"I absolve thee."

Now, what our readers want to know is this:—whether these words "I absolve thee," were used in the ancient Church or not?

We do think this a most important question. If these words were always used in the ancient Church from the time of Christ and His apostles, then the Church of Rome might have fair grounds to say that Protestants have abolished one of the sacraments of the Gospel which Christ Himself ordained. But if these words, which the Church of Rome now considers essential to her sacrament of penance, were never used in the ancient Church for a THOUSAND YEARS and more after Christ, as Protestants say, then it is equally clear that the so called sacrament, of which these words are an essential part, is an invention of men, and no sacrament of the Gospel of Christ.

This brings the question to a point between the Church of Rome, on the one side, and the Church of England and Ireland, on the other, as well as anything we have seen; and, therefore, we think the question proposed to us is a very good, as well as a very important, question—whether the ancient Church did or did not use the words "I absolve thee" in her forms of absolution; and we shall apply ourselves to it under the same sense of responsibility, and with the same attention to evidence, which governs all our writing.

After careful search, our conviction is that the words "I absolve thee" were never pronounced by man in the Church of God for TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS after the time of Christ, and that, therefore, the sacrament of the Church of Rome, of which these words are an essential part, is an invention of man in very modern times.

To show our readers on what evidence this opinion is founded, we will produce all the ancient formularies of absolution in the ancient Church which we have been able to find.

We steadfastly hold that Christ's ministers have an authority and power from Him to be exercised in the putting away of men's sins; but we also find that for TWELVE hundred years no Christian minister ever thought that this ministry was to be exercised by pronouncing the words "I absolve thee," which are now the essential "form" of absolution in the Church of Rome.

If any of our Roman Catholic correspondents can now produce any formulary of the Church, or any instance in which any priest did ever pronounce these words over a penitent within twelve hundred years after Christ, we presume they will now produce it. We, after careful search, are bold to say that they can produce nothing of the kind. If they can, let them do it; we, in the meantime, will produce the formularies which were used in the early Church.

We take first the forms of the Greek Church, because the Greek formularies are generally older than the Latin. We take the Greek forms from the *Rituale Græcæ* of Jac. Goar, the Pope's missionary to the Greek Churches, shortly before the year 1647.

The one striking characteristic which we find in all the ancient Greek forms of absolution is this—that the Greek Bishops and Fathers, looking steadfastly at the words which our Saviour said to His apostles, "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose sins ye retain, they are retained," did thereupon PRAY to God that He would remit the sins of the penitent Himself, but did NEVER take on themselves to say, "I absolve thee."

The first formulary of this kind in Goar is the following prayer, in p. 662:—

"O sovereign Lord our God! O only begotten Son and Word of the Father, who hast broken every chain of our sins by Thy passion, and hast breathed upon the faces of Thy apostles, saying, 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whose sins ye retain, they are retained;' Thou Sovereign, by Thy holy apostles, hast granted for the time to the ministers in Thy holy Church on earth to put away sins, and to bind and loose every chain of iniquity. We, therefore, pray Thee now for our brother such a one, standing before Thee; grant him Thy mercy, breaking through the chain of his sins, if he has spoken in ignorance or carelessness; or what he has done through infirmity, do Thou, who knowest human weakness, as a humane and good Master, pardon all his sins, willingly and unwillingly committed, because Thou art He who has compassion on those who are bound; who raisest up those who are cast down, the hope of those who have no hope, the rest of the fallen; and deliver Thy servant from the chain of sins."

\* Translated by Professor Donovan, of Maynooth, p. 145. Dublin. 1829.

† Ed. Paris. 1647.

\* Vide Gobelinus, p. 341, and Von der Hardt.

\* Von der Hardt, iv., 329.

\* The spot occupied by Huss during this memorable scene is still pointed out in the Cathedral of Constance. It is about half way down the nave, at the right hand, near one of the central pillars.

This prayer to God was then the form by which bishops and priests thought they were to perform their office in loosing men's sins.

Another form follows, in p. 668, which is also a prayer for the loosing of sin.

Another form, in page 666, is still a prayer that God will loose from the bond of sin.

In page 668, Goar gives another form, as follows: "O Lord our God, who wast present to Thy holy disciples and apostles, the doors being shut, and gavest to them Thy peace, saying, 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them, and whose sins ye retain they are retained, do Thou, most merciful Lord, intercede for this Thy servant such a one, and loose his sins, and cleanse the filth and defilement of his soul. For since having fallen into excesses he has fled to Thee, who alone art easy to be appeased; and as Thou hast loosed the harlots and publicans who formerly sinned, and hast given to them a perfect forgiveness, so loose Thy servant, such a one, from the bond of separation which rests on him, because Thou desirest that all men should be saved, and should come to the knowledge of the truth,' &c."

At page 673 Goar gives another form, in which the priest is directed to pray, "Do Thou receive with Thy accustomed humanity Thy servant such a one, who repents of the sins which he has committed." In another form in the same page the priest speaks thus: "Do Thou, O Lord, release, remit, pardon, the sins, the iniquities, the offences, willingly or unwillingly, knowingly or ignorantly, through transgression or disobedience, committed by these Thy servants. . . . So be it, O benign Lord; hear us entreating Thy goodness for these Thy servants, and overlook, as most merciful, all their sins; delivering them from eternal destruction, for Thou, O Lord, hast said, 'Whatsoever things ye bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever things ye loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven.'"

Here the words spoken by our Saviour about loosing and binding are made the grounds of the priest praying that He will loose from sin, but not of the priest undertaking to forgive sin.

The form which follows in Goar, p. 674, is also remarkable: "O Lord our God, who gavest remission of sins to Peter, and to the harlot in her tears, and justified the publican confessing his offences, receive the confession of Thy servant, and if he has committed any sin, willingly or unwillingly, in word or deed or thought, do Thou as a good and benignant God to give him, FOR THOU ONLY HAST POWER TO FORGIVE SINS; and to Thee we ascribe glory," &c.

The following form, in the same page, 674, is more especially a form of absolution for sins confessed to the priest: "God, who for our sins was made man, and bearing the sins of the whole world, through His beneficent goodness, take away all these things which thou hast related before me unworthy, pardoning thee all things, both in this life and in that to come, and grant them to stand uncondemned before His judgment-seat, He who wills that all men should be saved, and carest for the salvation of all; who is blessed for ever and ever."

This prayer is remarkable, not merely for attributing all forgiveness to God, as all the others do, but for expecting a full forgiveness in this world, as well as in the world to come, thus excluding that notion of satisfaction for temporal punishment on which the doctrine of purgatory is founded.

In page 675, Goar gives the following form: "O God, who pardoned by Nathan the Prophet, David confessing his sins, and Peter at last weeping for his denial, and the harlot weeping upon His undefiled feet, and the publican, and the prodigal; and who saidst, 'Confess your sins one to another; and, if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us all and to cleanse us from all sin,' may He, our Saviour and Lord, Jesus Christ, pardon thee all things which now before Him thou hast confessed to me insignificant, and which thou hast forgotten, in the present life and in that to come; and grant thee to stand uncondemned before Him, who is blessed for ever."

The following is given by Goar, p. 675, as a form of St. Chrysostom:—

"O Sovereign Lord, Jesus Christ, our God, who didst pardon by Nathan the cases of Peter, of the woman who was a sinner, of Manasses in Babylon, of the prodigal, the publican, the thief on the cross, and then proceeds—"Who hast said, 'Confess your sins to one another in turn;' as Thou hast said, Thou art faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all pollutions of the flesh and spirit, do Thou, all good and all merciful Lord, pardon all things which my spiritual son such a one has confessed with contrition of heart in Thy presence to me insignificant, both in this life and in the life to come, and grant that he may stand uncondemned before Thee."

Goar collected the foregoing formularies out of the ancient manuscripts from which he took the Greek liturgies, which manuscripts were transcribed in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

Goar appears to have felt the awkwardness of not being able to produce a single ancient formulary containing the words "I absolve thee;" and he admits that a question arises, whether these forms "effect or accom-

plish anything in respect of this sacrament (of penance), when on the face of them no form of words is therein contained which can be thought to include in itself the true form of absolution."

With the candour which belongs to real learning, Goar admits the fact, as well in respect of the Roman or Latin forms as the Eastern or Greek forms. His words are as follows:—"And, indeed, if it is lawful to conjecture from ecclesiastical history, from ancient rituals, from tradition, or from other unexceptionable testimonies, there are many who now freely assert, boldly propound, clearly teach, and happily write, that in the Latin Church the ancient form of the sacrament of penance or absolution was composed in words of prayer, and that the indicative and judicative form, so to speak, which we now use, 'I absolve thee from thy sins,' is not older than about four centuries, nor is found in any sacramentaries, nor mentioned by the more ancient writers, and that, therefore, MORE RECENTLY, but yet with great weight of reason, the Church was moved to have brought in that form as the common form, and to be used by all."

A confession more honourable to the learning and the candour of Goar could not be imagined.

But Goar was a priest of the Church of Rome, and as such felt himself bound to maintain her cause by the best arguments he could devise; and he was not deficient in that ingenuity which is so essential to the advocates of the Church of Rome.

So Goar tries to solve the difficulty:—"And, certainly, although the form of this sacrament be in the words of prayer, yet that does not exclude, but it contains, the act of the minister, and so can be reduced to the indicative form, and like the indicative implicitly requires the necessary mercy of God to the penitent; therefore, he who says 'remit, relax, pardon,' understands, BY ME. In like manner, 'Let it please Thee that Thy servant be loosed by the word' supply—'by my word.'"

Can anything be more simple than this? It is true the bishops and priests of the Church of God for the first TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS did never do more than pray to God that he would forgive sins; but, then, you have only to put into their prayers words which they NEVER used, which would make it appear that they forgave the sins themselves, and then it is all right, according to the Church of Rome.

But the fact stands confessed that the ancient bishops and fathers for twelve hundred years did never use such words, but did only pray that God would forgive the sins; and the candour of real learning compels Goar himself, even after he had proposed this ingenious device, to repeat the same confession again—"The Latins are not able to show a form of absolution conceived in these words, 'I absolve thee,' in any rituals more ancient than the fourth century from this (i.e., about the year 1240), which yet they profess to have received from the holy fathers by a succession of tradition."

Can any one believe this, that the ancient Fathers should have successively delivered to each other from the beginning that sins were to be forgiven by the priest saying "I forgive thee thy sins;" and yet that the formularies of the Church for twelve hundred years should always agree in praying that God Himself would do that work—forgive the sins Himself.

But if the Church of God was under this error for twelve hundred years, the Bishop of Rome should, of course, at last correct it when he found it out. Better late than never. If infallible Popes left the Church without a sacrament of the Gospel for twelve hundred years, it was time for them to correct it.

So Goar, at page 677, gives corrected forms prepared by the Pope for the Greeks, in which he inserts in the first prayer—"Pardoning him, THROUGH ME. Thy unworthy servant, every offence, voluntary and involuntary." And in the second prayer—"I absolve thee from all thy sins which thou hast confessed before God, and my unworthiness." And in the third prayer—"I pardon thee all thy sins."

Goar states, page 678, that this form was used in his time by all the Greeks living in Calabria, Apulia, and Sicily—that is, by the Greeks in Italy and Sicily who had submitted to the

Pope, and whom the Pope indulged in the use of their own forms, altered only so far as he thought essential.

But Goar feels it would be very awkward if these modern forms could not be supported by any ancient authority. Goar, therefore, brings forward a formulary from the most ancient enchiridion in the Barberini Library, p. 678, note at the end. The formulary itself is given in pages 679 and 680. There is nothing very much to the purpose in page 679; but in page 680 there are two prayers worth noting. The first is as follows, in which the priest says—"My spiritual son, I am lowly and a sinner, I am not able to forgive upon earth the sins of him who confesses to my lowliness; but God is, and through that divinely spoken word which he made after His resurrection, and said to His apostles, 'Whose sins ye remit,' &c.; confiding in that word, we also say, whatever things thou hast related to my lowliness, and whatever you were prevented saying, either through ignorance or forgetfulness, or from whatever cause, MAY GOD PARDON THEE in this life, and the life to come."

The second prayer has this heading, "Add also this prayer," which prayer is as follows:—"O God, who through the prophet Nathan didst pardon David, confessing his evil deeds; and Peter weeping bitterly his denial; and the harlot shedding tears upon Thy feet; and the publican; and the prodigal. God Himself pardon thee, through me a sinner, both in this life, and in that to come, and make thee stand uncondemned before His fearful judgment-seat, and have no care concerning the crimes confessed. Go in peace."

The first of these is unquestionably genuine and accurate; but it is as much against the Church of Rome as any other genuine formulary, because it takes the words of Christ only as grounds for the priest to pray that God would forgive the sins. The second prayer appears to support Goar's argument, because the priest prays "that God will pardon thee through me," thus making the priest the instrument of forgiving the sin. But here, again, the candour of Goar in matters of learning comes in; and he adds in a note on the prayer which contains the words "pardon thee through me"—"In the printed copies, however, and in all other manuscript copies, it is WANTING."

Truly there is nothing that damages the arguments of the Church of Rome so much as when her learned advocates are compelled by the candour of real learning to tell the truth.

The fact now stands out in striking and unmistakable proofs that for TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS after Christ no bishop or priest of the Church of God did ever address to a penitent those words, "I absolve thee."

Let Roman Catholics ponder on this. Let them tell us by what right their priests now dare to say those awful words; and let them tell us how the sacrament of penance in their Church, of which those words are declared by the Council of Trent to be the essential form, can be considered a sacrament of the Gospel, instituted by Christ Himself.

In our next number we will give the forms of absolution which were use in the Church of Rome herself, for 1200 years.

#### FATHER FURNISS AND THE RAMBLER.

WE have no doubt that Dr. Cullen and his coadjutors often find it a puzzling practical question, how to deal with the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. On the one hand, they cannot but feel that it is damaging to their cause that they should be seen to shrink from candid and temperate discussion. They know very well that many of our intelligent Roman Catholic readers want to know if it is really the case that our statements and arguments admit of no reply; or if the priests can answer them, why do they not. But, on the other hand, the Roman Catholic leaders have an instinctive conviction that discussion and argument are not really for the interest of their cause. Of two evils they must choose the least. By attempting to answer our paper they would run the risk of making known its existence to many who are now ignorant of it, and, by exciting their curiosity, might increase the number of our readers. While even for those Roman Catholics who do read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN it is, perhaps, safer that they should be told that the priests, no doubt, could answer us very effectively if they thought it worth their while, than to bring matters to a crisis by attempting answers which, after all, might not turn out satisfactory. Accordingly, silence and affected contempt is the policy which it has been judged most expedient to pursue towards us, and we fully believe that Dr. Cullen and his friends are wise in their generation.

If there was ever a time, however, when it cost them an effort to persevere in their silent system, we fancy it must have been when the real character was exposed of Father Furniss's book, "What every Christian must know." They might calmly see us expose their errors on points of doctrine, trusting for their safety to men's general indifference to controversial discussion; but when the question is about those plain rules of morality which every one can understand, it is not equally safe to remain silent. We gave extracts in which lying and dishonesty and undutifulness to parents were made light of. Our readers could satisfy themselves by the expenditure of one halfpenny that our quotations were perfectly accurate, and it was not strange if they asked themselves whether a Church could be infallible whose authorised teachers give instruction so contrary to the plain rules of morality.

\* An aliquid circa sacramentum hocce valeant aut efficiant, cum nulla in eis verborum series primis: fro. te deprehendatur, quæ veram absolutionis formam in se includere possit existimari.—p. 676, n.

\* Goar wrote his about 1640; so he considered the form "I absolve thee," to have arisen about the year 1240.

\* Atque æquid si ex ecclesiastica historia, ritualibus antiquis, traditione, aut aliis non expiendis testimoniis conficere licet, antiquam in Ecclesia Latinâ, Penitentis sacramenti sive absolutionis formam, ce. recitavit verbis compositam fuisse; eamque indicativam et judicativam, ut ita loquar, quæ nunc utimur, absolvo te a peccatis tuis, quatuor ceteris sæculorum ætatem non superare, nec antiquius in sacramentalibus reperiri, aut ab antiquioribus scriptoribus referri, producere necesse est, æquo tam in rationum pondere motum ecclesiam, quam ut communem et ab omnibus recipiendam induxisset; plures jam sunt qui libere asserunt, tenaciter propagant, clare dicunt, et foeliciter scribunt.—Goar. Ritualis Gæcorum, p. 676, n.

\* Et certe forma hujus sacramenti etsi deprecativa, non excludit, imo continet actionem multâtri, siquæ ad indicativam potest reduci; quænammodum indicativa Dei misericordiam penitentis necessariam expostulat implere. Qui ergo dicit, ἀνεις, ἀφες, συγχώρησον; dimitti, relaxa, condona, subintelliget, per me; tem τον δουλον σου τω λογω λυθηναι ενδοκησον, complacet tibi nunc servum tuum verbo (supra le meo) so et.—p. 676, n.

\* Latini quarto ab hinc sæculo in antiquiori, si ritualibus indicativam sacramenti penitentis formam his verbis, absolvo te a peccatis tuis conceptam nequeunt ostendere, quæ tamen ævæ sanctæ traditionis serie ab antiquis Patribus acceptæ præstiterunt.—p. 676, n.